



Kamyar Guivetchi, P.E.
Manager, Statewide Water Planning
Department of Water Resources
P.O. Box 942836
Sacramento, CA 94236

March 11, 2005

Subject: Comments on the Public Review Draft of the “California Water Plan Highlights” document dated March 2005.

Dear Kamyar:

We are pleased to see a concise presentation of the State Water Plan, as represented by the “Highlights” brochure and we are pleased to see the subject of water efficiency and conservation so frequently mentioned in the brochure. It is a message that needs to come from DWR and be embedded in statewide water policy and the state’s strategic water plan – as represented by Bulletin 160.

On the other hand, the brochure badly fails to connect the dots that tell the story that water use efficiency can be one of the future scenarios for the state and that the water use scenario described as “Less Resource Intensive” can solve future state water supply needs without increasing major surface storage or increasing north to south export capabilities.

At the start of the Public Advisory Committee’s work with DWR four years ago, we were encouraged by the planned use of Scenarios to describe potential directions for the state to examine. However, we are now extremely disappointed that the one scenario that would examine the type of future described above has not been made visible to the reader and is misleading as a scenario potential in the way it is described in the brochure.

Therefore, we have two key recommended changes that we believe must be made to the brochure – and to Bulletin 160 – for it to accurately reflect the options open to the state for its water future and to accurately reflect the work of the Public Advisory Committee:

1. The scenario now labeled “Less Resource Intensive” needs to be described in terms that clearly delineate it as a low water usage option. It must include descriptors such as “more aggressive urban and agricultural water use efficiency than is currently planned; more water made available to the environment for habitat restoration; more dependence on groundwater storage; no further

construction of major surface storage or Delta export facilities,” and similar actions that express the true intent of this alternative scenario that will be examined in the future.

- Although we are troubled by a number of misleading charts and data in the brochure (Wild and Scenic River “Applied Water Use (Page 2), unsupported data for Water Demand Changes by Scenario (Page 4), unnecessarily conservative and unsupported data for “Additional Supply” shown in the chart on Page 15), the overall thrust of the data – which demonstrates that the state can come up with adequate supplies for the future through increased efficiencies – support the need for this scenario to be clearly called out.
2. In view of the importance paid to the subject of conservation and water efficiency throughout the brochure, we believe that the “Roadmap to 2030” (Page 6) should be consistent with those words and have the “Water Use Efficiency” actions elevated in importance as one of the high priority “Initiatives for Reliability.” We have previously made this recommendation to you; it is consistent with the words used in the brochure and would be consistent with the improved scenario description recommended above.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this important document, which we understand will be used to brief legislators, key state officials and water agencies throughout the state. They need to receive a clear and complete message of the options open to the state for its 2030 water future.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Nick DiCroce". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large, stylized initial "N" that loops around.

For California Trout

Copies to:

Senator Sheila Kuehl, Attn: Dennis O’Conner

Senator Michael J. Machado, Attn: Dennis O’Conner

Assemblymember Lois Wolk, Attn: Alf Brandt

Assemblymember Fran Pavley, Attn: Adrienne Alvord

Assemblymember John Laird, Attn: Clyde Macdonald